mathematics. At least, he found one who could teach him surveying; and, in a country in process of settlement, where great allotments of land were being mapped, staked off, and subdivided, there was sure to be business for a surveyor. While still a boy, he was employed by Lord Fairfax to make some surveys of his lands on the upper Potomac, and, becoming thus to some extent a protégé of that territorial magnate, was brought to the notice of influential men as a young fellow who would do whatever he undertook to do, and do it faithfully.

Again, Lawrence, his elder brother, was a member of the Ohio Company and much interested in the lands on that river, for which he anticipated a great future. When the far-reaching designs of the French on the great basin drained by the Mississippi and its affluents became apparent, Lawrence, no doubt, foresaw that the Ohio valley and its trade would soon have to be fought for; and, through his influence with the Governor and Burgesses, he procured George a commission as major of militia. So when the French began building forts, and orders came from England to Dinwiddie to notify them to desist, who so fit for the mission as Major Washington? It was true he could not speak French, but he could take an interpreter; and whatever the issue of the mission, he could be relied upon to bring back valuable information and perhaps sketch-maps of the unknown country. And thus the young soldier-surveyor was connected with the settlement of the great question whether North America was to be French or English.

His brief military service, and the affair with de Jumonville, though disastrous, taught Washington invaluable lessons. It was not merely that he heard bullets whistle and built a little fort. He gained knowledge of the country, of the Indians, and how to deal with them, and of the art of frontier warfare; and he acquired a decided taste for a military life. When Braddock came with his regulars, he had to rely on some one who knew the country, and Washington, who had just been over the ground, was naturally the man to whom he turned; so he placed him on his staff. Out of the catastrophe which followed, Washington was the only officer who emerged with increased reputation. When others lost their heads, and the commanding officer did not think himself safe anywhere west of Philadelphia, Washington kept cool, heartened the panic-stricken settlers, and put the frontier in a state of defence. When the war of 1756 broke out, men did not forget the young officer who kept calm amid the general terror and flurry, and who always knew what to do; and they made him commander-in-chief of the Virginia militia, and second in rank of all the provincial officers. But there was little left for

him to do. Fort Du Quesne was abandoned, the war rolled to the far northeast, where the great controversy was settled for all time. Washington considered his military career at an end; he resigned his commission in 1758, settled down to the peaceful occupations of a planter, and closed one chapter of his life, which, as it turned out, was only the preface.

Seventeen years thus quietly passed away—one quarter of his life, and the years in which men usually mould their lives. From the age of twenty-six to that of forty-three, Washington's mind was chiefly occupied with the rotation of crops, reclaiming of waste land, improving of stock, and other villatic cares, and vexed with derelictions of lazy, thievish, or drunken overseers. He had for a while a seat in the House of Burgesses, but does not seem to have taken a prominent part in public affairs. The French troubles being settled, there seemed not the remotest probability that the quiet Virginia planter, now well past the middle of life, would ever again draw his sword, or emerge from the modest semi-obscurity of a respectable country gentleman. He took some interest in public affairs, regretted the Stamp Act, and was glad to hear of its repeal; was sorry that the ministry were acting so unwisely; regretted the tea-tax, and hoped that the non-importation associations might bring Townshend and the rest to their senses. When the news came of the Boston Port Bill, and the more fiery spirits began to talk of an appeal to arms, he "went to church and fasted all day."

Events hurried on with dizzying rapidity. A congress of delegates from all the colonies was agreed upon, and Virginia elected her representatives. Peace was still hoped for; but war—desired by some, deprecated by others—was seen approaching. At the Virginia Convention of 1775, when Patrick Henry was breathing war, and urgent for arming the militia, Washington remained silent; probably with gloomy forebodings. Lexington and Concord turned the scale. The second Congress resolved to organize an army; and, on the nomination of Thomas Johnson of Maryland, supported by John Adams of Massachusetts, Washington was appointed commander-in-chief of the Continental forces.

The choice must have puzzled many. We who have learned to look upon Washington as the natural chief, the man of men, are apt to forget that the men of that time could not know what we know. All but a few must have asked wonderingly what it was that designated the Virginia farmer as worthiest of this high honor, as best fitted to assume this terrible responsibility. Not his brief military record, for that (though through no fault of his own) had been mostly associated with disaster. Not an illustrious lineage and powerful family connections, for he could not reckon

back his own pedigree beyond the fourth degree, and did not know what part of England his American ancestor came from. Not his wealth, for, though he held much land, he was comparatively a poor man. Not his persuasive or enkindling eloquence, for he was slow and diffident of speech, and in public bodies usually sat silent. Not his fiery patriotism, for his moderate views and aversion to extreme measures must have seemed lukewarm to the impetuous Henry and the ardent Mason.

Some have supposed that the choice was due to the rivalries between more conspicuous candidates, and that Washington was taken as a "dark horse"—a man of good standing and no enemies, upon whom all could agree. No doubt political considerations did, to some extent, influence the choice; but we can not think so poorly of the leading men in the country's councils as to suppose that they were guided by no higher motives at a crisis so momentous. We must believe that it was because not only his fellow-Virginians, but his colleagues in Congress, had learned to recognize in him qualities far beyond birth, fortune, or brilliant genius; the firm mind not veered by popular winds; the sober judgment that weighed well before deciding; an unhesitating devotion to right, and a constancy that no trials could shake.

The task before him was one of almost inconceivable difficulty. With no military experience beyond frontier warfare, and no experience whatever in organizing an army, he had to create the army of the continent and plan regular campaigns. Of his major generals there was hardly more than one who could give him the support he needed. His soldiers were raw recruits, without drill, and with hardly a conception of discipline, who were to be taught to hold their own against the solid columns of disciplined veterans led by experienced officers. The general was the servant of the Congress, and Congress the servant of the States; and Congress was distracted by petty rivalries and jealousies, while most of the States were dilatory and penurious, each anxious to place the burdens of the war on other shoulders. Whichever way he turned, he met with hindrance, if not downright opposition.

For the story of the war we refer our readers to the pages of Mr. Ford, who treats it from the biographical point of view, showing Washington as the central figure bringing order out of chaos, harmony out of distraction, and finally victory out of impending ruin. This accomplished and peace secured, Washington resigned his commission to Congress that had conferred it, and again retired to Mt. Vernon to spend, as he hoped, the remainder of his days in a private station.

This, however, was not to be. A constitution had to be framed and Washington's counsels could not be spared. Never were his

moderation and balance of mind more needed. From the very first, two antagonistic views showed themselves, giving rise to the two great parties, which (under various names) have ever since divided the country. Hamilton and his followers believed that a constitutional monarchy was the best of all governments; and, while they did not advocate a monarchy for the United States, they thought that the nearer the government approached to it, the better. They profoundly distrusted the masses; wished to see the government in the hands of men of property and intelligence, and the central power increased at the expense of the States and of the people. Given the substance of monarchy, the people might well be flattered with the name of a republic. The party of which Jefferson was the leader had an abhorrence of monarchy and dread of centralization. It had firm faith in the people; believed in the integrity of their motives; and thought that individual follies would neutralize each other, and the resultant action be certainly patriotic, and probably wise. Both parties saw that the reserved rights of the States were the barrier against empire; so to the one they were an obstruction to be removed, to the other a rampart to be defended. Each was too optimistic. Experience has shown that wealth and intelligence do not always imply distinterested devotion to the public good; and it has also shown that the people may be foolish in masses, as well as individuals, and that patriotic millions may concur in what is the height of unwisdom.

Through this critical period, when jealousies, animosities, and conflicting interests so nearly wrecked the ship of state before it was fairly launched, Washington pursued a conservative course. He was not a partisan of either Hamilton or Jefferson, and his position as presiding officer of the Convention made neutrality obligatory. The constitution once framed, he used all his influence to procure its adoption by the States. With the adoption came the unanimous choice of Washington as the first President of the United States.

Perhaps his trials in this position were greater than those he had undergone as commander-in-chief. Parties were fiercely hostile, and recrimination embittered controversy. Washington, who tried to conciliate and avoid extremes, was malignantly attacked, both privately and openly. The outbreak of the French Revolution produced dangerous divisions. The country had a warm and natural affection for France, but was that to extend to the furious mob that had beheaded, with atrocious cruelty, the king who had come to our aid, and the chivalrous D'Estaing, and was clamorous for the blood of Rochambeau and Lafayette?—that seemed to be launched on a career which, if persisted in, would

destroy not only civilized society, but the conditions which make civilized society possible? Happily for Washington, the scandalous behavior of Genet, the emissary of the Directory, furnished him with reasons for demanding his recall, which even Robespierre approved. A treaty with England followed in due time.

Wearied with the labors and anxieties of eight years of office, Washington resolved to retire, and on March 4th, 1797, he took a final leave of public life and retired to Mt. Vernon, where he died on December 14th, 1799.

Allusion has already been made to the growth of a Washington myth, or at least a tendency to regard him as a partly allegorical personage. Probably nothing favors such a conception so much as his presidential career and the extreme difficulty one has in reconciling it with natural laws. A president who looks upon himself as the president of a whole people, and not of his party only; who regards political services as not the chief recommendation to office, who weighs measures by their intrinsic merit, and not by their probable influence upon the elections; who accepts a gift from his native State only on condition that he may devote it to a public use—such a president now seems naturally to belong to the realm of allegory or poetic dream, like Buddha or Zarathustra.

THE QUESTION OF A CATHOLIC DAILY PRESS.

At the recent meeting of the English Truth Society, Father P. A. Finlay, S. J., read a paper on the topic: A Catholic Daily Newspaper, from which we reproduce some passages for the benefit of American readers:

"By a newspaper press I do not understand periodicals which appear at widely separated intervals—each quarter of a year, every month, or even weekly. Nor do I refer to publications which are wholly or mainly religious—which are chiefly busied with ecclesiastical announcements and the discussion of points of faith or morality. Least of all is it my intention to express any judgment on the daily and weekly press, so ably conducted by Catholics for Catholics in these countries, to which Catholic interests owe so much. I have no such acquaintance with it as would warrant me to offer an opinion on its merits, and it would be singularly ungracious to criticise a body of our fellow-Catholics to whom we are so greatly indebted. By a Catholic newspaper press, then, I mean periodical publications, appearing as frequently as the great non-Catholic newspapers, dealing with the same topics, addressed to the same class of readers, but written and edited in the main by Catholics for Catholics, and on distinctly

Catholic principles. I would have weekly, bi-weekly, daily papers, which should be excellently written, which should provide their readers with the news to be gathered from every available source, which should discuss public measures and public men, should further all social interests, should inform the public mind on scientific and literary questions, should be a guide in public amusements, and should do all this in entire accord with the teachings of the Catholic religion; and I would not have such a press to be non-political. I do not conceive that there is any recognised party in the State to which a Catholic may not lawfully belong..... There can be no reason why a Catholic newspaper, as an individual Catholic, may not take sides in party politics and strive after party objects. But, while fully up to the level of the merely secular press in all these secular matters, and therefore not wholly nor even preponderatingly religious, a Catholic newspaper will find its chief concern in Catholic religious interests. It will honestly endeavor to safeguard and further the truest welfare of those for whom it is mainly written. The primary object of a Catholic newspaper can not be to secure a vast circulation, or to wield political and social influence, or to pay satisfactory dividends to shareholders. It may aim at these things too, and may compass them; but its first object—if it be a Catholic paper—must be to help forward the Catholic people among whom it circulates—to protect and promote their interests in the order which their importance claims for them. Is it not clear that there must be abundant, ever-recurring, opportunity in a daily paper, for the right interpretation and courageous application of Catholic principles? Furthermore, though, indeed, it is one of these Catholic principles themselves, a Catholic paper will be, in religious questions, and in deciding what are religious questions, completely at one with ecclesiastical authority.

And, now, is there any need for such a Catholic newspaper press amongst us? The answer, I think, is dependent on two considerations. One: Have we, Catholics, any important interests which are peculiarly our own? The other: Can these interests—if they really exist—be duly safeguarded and advanced in any other fashion? We have important interests which are peculiarly our own.... We have to purify, if possible, the stage—the metropolitan stage particularly, which, we are told, is sinking, mainly through the connivance of Catholics, to the moral level of London and Paris. We have to watch the influences of political measures and political methods on the religious and moral life of our Catholic population; we have to foster the union and mutual love of priests and people; we have to draw closer the bonds that unite us all with the visible centre of our religion—the Holy Ro-

man See—and we might lengthen out the list indefinitely. And it is through a Catholic press, such as we have described it, that we can best promote these interests..... We found sodalities into which our people can enter; we strive to build up Catholic societies; we hold missions; we address meetings; we publish books and pamphlets—to maintain and to diffuse Catholic principles and ideals; and the most powerful means to do this—a Catholic periodical, daily press, we practically neglect. No doubt we have Catholic quarterlies in the English language; we have some few monthlies; we are not without Catholic weeklies, which meet a real need, and do a great good; and Catholic Truth Societies have arisen..... to combat the spread of irreligious publications, to make known the true doctrine of Catholicism, and to provide useful, or at least harmless, reading matter for the growing multitudes of Catholic men and women who will read, whether you will or not. But no one will contend that these agencies reach the great bulk of our Catholic population; that they can deal fittingly and insistently with the vital interests—directly and indirectly religious—on which Catholics require instruction and leading; that they exercise a very widespread and serious influence on the Catholic life of the nation. No one, I think, would for a moment compare their efficiency and power with that of a cheap Catholic daily press."

Dealing with the possibility of such a press, the lecturer said it had been achieved elsewhere, in Germany, Italy, and France, and why not here?

"There is, of course, the 'vis inertiæ' to be overcome—the tendency among us to believe that the old ways are good enough. There is the number—far too considerable—of men and women who will gladly help a victorious cause, but will venture nothing to win a victory. There are the Catholic advertisers who by themselves alone could bestow success, but who advertise at present through other channels, and there are the Catholic readers to be won over from neutral or anti-Catholic papers. Further, you must be prepared for money losses. You can not refuse unsuitable advertisements and criticise as they deserve indecent plays or other publications, and combat the religious bigotry of public companies, and aim genenerally at lofty religious and moral standards without paying a price—a considerable money price—for "the luxury of principles." A Catholic press would need much support, both monetary and moral, at least in its beginning, and I am not very confident that sufficient such support would be forthcoming at present. It is true, of course, that we spend great sums on churches, convents, schools, and hospitals, and much of the money spent on them is not more useful to religion than

would be the money spent on founding and forwarding a great Catholic newspaper.....Still, we have numbers on our side; we have enthusiasts; we have a rightful cause, a crying need, and men and means sufficient. There are no hindrances in the way which persistence and ability may not conquer, and I am sure that a Catholic newspaper press is then at least certain to arise amongst us, when one or other of two events occurs: when a great Catholic organisation, on the lines of the German *Volksverein*, has spread throughout the country and has welded together the Catholic population, gentle and simple, countryman and townsman, priest and layman, into one compact body, instinct with Catholic feeling, earnest for Catholic rights, at one with the divinely appointed rulers of the Catholic Church; or, when these rulers themselves—the bishops of our Church—shall judge it fitting to appeal to Catholics and counsel them to build up and to support a press that shall be unreservedly and outspokenly Catholic."

* * *

RE-RATING PLAN FOR THE CATHOLIC KNIGHTS OF AMERICA.

Judging by the contents of the *C. K. of A. Journal* (the official organ of that society) recently received, the necessity of revising the insurance rates of this organization is at last recognized by the leading members, and the dicussion of that question goes merrily on. As usual, there are a number of propositions being made, all with the object to save the order from bankruptcy without spending any more money than can be helped, and also as usual, there are a number of voices clamoring "to let well enough alone."

One fact is apparent to the casual observer trained in life insurance matters: It is a sort of superstitious belief that a "fraternal" insurance company ought to be able to furnish life insurance equal to the best at prices from 20% to 30% lower than the rates of regular companies furnishing protection as a business matter.

Even the best informed members seem to hold this view and do not hesitate to make unfair comparisons regarding cost, in order to prove their claims, as will be shown directly.

Mr. Kadeski figures quite prominently in the discussion. For a layman he has undoubtedly devoted a great deal of time and trouble to the investigation of the subject and many of his conclusions are perfectly sound. Yet in a table headed "Food for Thought," published in the *Journal* of March 1st, 1904, he is quoting as "old line 33⅓% for expenses and reserve" a list of premiums which are participating in profits, and not even the

cheapest participating rates at that. Such a comparison is certainly misleading and will only increase the general prejudice of "assessment people" to the old line insurance companies.

For his information we will quote below for a few ages the non-participating and participating rates (per $1,000) of the largest life insurance in the world alongside of his own figures to show the difference.

Age.	Non-participating.	Participating.	Mr. Kadeski.
25	16.46	21.34	21.49
30	18.74	24.18	24.38
35	21.70	27.88	28.11
40	25.62	32.76	33.01
45	30.90	39.36	39.55
50	38.14	48.39	48.48

As this article is not intended for advertising any old line insurance company, we will simply state here the fact that perfectly reliable life insurance can be bought at the above named "non-participating" rates and that therefore in any comparison made between old-line and assessment insurance premiums above given "non-participating" rates only should be used.

Of all the new plans submitted, that we have seen, Mr. Kadeski's proposition undoubtedly deserves the most consideration, as he advocates the correct principle, "level premium during the life of the member." What we must take exception to, is the basing of the proposed new rates on the so-called "National Fraternal Congress table of mortality," since that table is still in the experimental stage, and it is pretty clear from the comments made in the *Journal*, as also from the experience had by other Catholic insurance societies, who submitted their affairs to an examination by well-known actuaries, that the actual mortality of the society, if it does not now, will in the near future, exceed the figures of the N. F. C. table, and then there will be trouble again.

In these columns it was repeatedly pointed out what a damaging effect on Catholic society life in general it must have, when members joining insurance orders in good faith and paying their contributions punctually for a number of years, find themselves deprived of the cherished protection for their families at a time, when either for reason of advanced age or impaired health they can not secure good life insurance elsewhere. That this is not a fancied danger, but an actual fact, is shown by a letter from a Catholic Knight, published in the *Journal* of February 1st, 1904, from which we quote:

"When they were solicited to join the C. K. of A. they were assured that the rates were permanently fixed; that they never

would be required to pay any more than the tabulated rate assessed for their age at that time. What confidence can the younger members have that the rates they pay will not be increased when they shall have been members for five, ten, fifteen or twenty years, as I have been? What assurance can be given to applicants that the rates in force when they join will not be changed later on, so that they will have to pay two, three, four, five, or six times as much as they do when they join?"

This man is right. It was risky, to put it mildly, to start such important business enterprises, as life insurance companies are, without knowing anything at all of the subject. Since the errors of the original plan are becoming evident and the need of a reorganization on safer lines is universally acknowledged, it were criminal to again experiment with what represents the hard-earned money and the family welfare of thousands of well-meaning, trusting Catholic members.

The public should be made to understand that the laws of nature apply equally to all, Catholics or Protestants, policy holders in regular life insurance companies or certificate holders in assessment organizations. The mortality tables used by the regular life insurance companies are the result of careful observations for over 100 years among insured lives in Europe and America. Some concession to the more favorable conditions in the United States has been made and the result is embodied in the so-called "American experience" table of mortality. But any of the standard mortality tables is perfectly safe as a basis for a regular life insurance company under normal conditions.

The "National Fraternal Congress" table is compiled from the experience of a number of assessment societies, for possibly 20 or 25 years. Among Catholic societies there is quite a number known to the writer, whose death losses are much heavier than the National Fraternal Congress table provides for. There is no reason to suppose that under normal conditions, with level rate premiums and attractive policies to keep members on the books, the mortality experience of Catholic societies will differ very materially from the experience of regular companies compiled for over 100 years. A difference of a dollar or two in the premium rate is of less importance to the members, than the knowledge that their policies will be paid in full under any circumstances.

Then again, the minimum rates for the standard tables exclusive of expense account are practically public property, and have been published in these columns. Below these no life insurance company can be permitted to do business. Why should Catholics think that they can furnish life insurance for less money than the insurance departments permit business concerns to charge?

A recognition of these truths would save our societies a lot of trouble and expense for actuaries' opinions, committees of investigation, and so forth. Let the mortality of any society be compared with the standard table rate. That ratio ascertained, it is an easy matter to adjust the minimum rate with proper addition for possible excess of mortality and needed expense account. Then charge your certificates as liabilities according to the proper reserve tables and see to it that the required money for the reserve or sinking fund is always on hand.

How to treat the present members of a society to be reorganized, has been shown in this journal time and again. Reorganize, but on a safe and permanent basis.

PRESENT-DAY LABOR PROBLEMS.

The findings and recommendations of the United States Industrial Commission on labor, as laid down in the XIX. volume of its extensive report, have not received the consideration which they deserve. Our readers are aware that the remarkable revolution in business methods and conditions of the past few years, showing itself in industrial combinations and the so-called community of interests, has been accompanied by an almost equally remarkable consolidation of labor interests through the growth and strengthening of labor organizations and the increase in labor legislation. Whatever may be the ultimate outcome of this growth of organization on both sides, its first tendency has been to bring about a more definite separation of the two, and in many cases a distinct confronting of one by the other, each relying partly upon the strength of its organization and partly upon legislation and the courts. In several industries there is recorded, especially in recent years, an interesting and important development of systems of conference and conciliation, by which the two interests, recognizing their dependence one upon the other and their need of harmonious action, have settled their differences in a peaceable way. To this phase of the development of labor and capital the Industrial Commission has given a large amount of attention. The relative strength of employers and employés varies widely, however, in different industries, and shows itself in the differences in profits and wages; differences in the methods and medium of payment of wages; differences in the hours of labor, health, and safety of the working people, and in the relative importance of the labor of women and children.

We shall present the findings and conclusions of the United

States Industrial Commission on these points in a series of brief papers which will repay careful perusal.

First we have the question of

Profit and Wages.

The problem of profit and wages has a double, wholly distinct aspect. We may compare the share going to wages with that going to owners of capital, land monopolies, etc., and again we may compare wages to prices of commodities. The laborer might obtain a greater share of the product of his labor and be worse off so far as the buying ability of his wages is concerned.

As to the first problem, what share of the social product is going to labor is perhaps hardest to solve, as existing statistics are misleading. The simplest and most apparent fallacy, which is often circulated, is to the effect that since capital gets, say, 10 per cent. upon its investment, therefore labor gets the remainder, viz, 90%. In this statement two entirely separate problems have been confused. That capital receives 10% on the investment is no indication of the proportion of the joint product which it receives. If the annual product is, for example, twice as great as the capital invested, then 10% on the investment would be 5% of the product; and on the other hand, if the annual product is one-half as much as the capital invested, then 10% on the investment would be 20% of the product. Only in case the annual product is exactly equal to the capital invested in its production, would it be true that the rate of profit on the investment would be the same as the proportion of the product going to capital. For these reasons, it is impossible to say that, since the rate of interest on capital has declined, therefore the share of capital in the joint product has declined. It requires so much larger investments of capital now than formerly to produce a given output that a reduction in the rate of interest may be accompanied by an actual increase in the amount of annual product necessary to pay the interest on the largely increased aggregate of capital employed. The rate of interest on one dollar of capital tells nothing as to the share which the aggregate capital gets from the joint product of labor and capital.

Equally misleading are the conclusions frequently drawn from the census of the United States respecting the proportion of the total product which goes to capital and labor respectively. The census of 1890, for example, estimated the value of manufactured products for the entire United States at $9,372,000,000, and the aggregate wages in the same industries at $2,283,000,000, according to which it would appear that labor received 24.36% of the

joint product. But this inference is manifestly wrong, since the cost of material used in manufactures was more than half the value of the product, viz, $5,162,000,000, or 55.08%. Miscellaneous expenses also were 6.73% of the total product. The proper method of enquiry into the proportion of the product going to labor is that which separates out the cost of material and endeavors to discover what proportion of the net product is assigned to labor. If this is done, it appears that in 1890 the net product of all manufacturing industries was $4,211,000,000, and of this net product the total wages paid would be 54% instead of 24%. The above figure for wages, however, includes salaried employés, officers, superintendents, firm members, and clerks. The payment to wage-earners, properly speaking (but including some overseers and foremen on salary), was $1,891,228,321, or 44.9% of the value of the net product of manufacturing industry.

The net product of manufacturing industry in the United States by the census of 1900 was $5,669,335,584; while the wages paid (not including any salaried officers) were $2,323,407,257, or 41% of the net product. According to the census of 1890, the amount paid for wages (including some salaried overseers and foremen whose extra compensation above that of wage-earners would not be sufficient to affect the percentage greatly) was equal to 44.9% of the net product. There has been a decrease in the proportion of the total product going to wage-earners; while the absolute amount going to the wage-working class has slightly decreased per capita during the decade. Wages in 1899, the year actually covered by the census figures, had not reached a point as high as in 1900 and 1901. In a period of rising prosperity wages ordinarily advanced less rapidly than prices and profit.

* * *

MINOR TOPICS.

Does the Earth Revolve?—The ancients, up to the time of Copernicus and Galilei, believed the earth to stand still; since then the theory has prevailed that it turns around its axis, and to-day he would be looked upon as an ignoramus or a fool who would deny the rotation of the earth. And yet competent savants and professors of science of our day are beginning to doubt the correctness of Galilei's theory. Amongst them is Poincaré, Professor of the Institute and President of the Astronomical Society of France.

In his work 'La Science et l'Hypothèse' he says: Absolute space, i. e., the receptacle in which the earth must be if it really turns, has no objective existence. Hence, the assertion that the

earth revolves, is senseless; experience will not allow us to verify it.

A body does not turn in relation to itself, but in relation to another body. To find out whether the earth turns, we would need as a point of comparison an immovable star, whose immovability was properly demonstrated. But this point of comparison is lacking.

I readily concede that the hypothesis of the earth's revolution is more logical and also more convenient. From the scientific view-point it gives a much simpler explanation of astronomic and mechanical phenomena. It simplifies certain equations and makes evident relations between physical and astronomical phenomena, that without it would remain unknown.

Suppose we did not know of the rotatory movement of the earth, and a physicist, for some other cause, would repeat the experiment of Foucault's pendulum. By observing the plane of oscillation turning steadily to the right, whilst the symmetry of the apparent movement does not allow us to suppose that the pendulum should turn in any direction, this physicist would be induced to conclude that there is a law by virtue of which the plane of the pendulum's oscillations is regularly deplaced. The hypothesis of the earth's rotation re-establishes the symmetry and explains the phenomenon.

Again, if we considered the sky with the notion that the stellar system turns around the earth, we would be obliged to attribute a vertiginous movement to the stars, particularly to those that can barely be seen through the telescope. Imagine these bodies making in twenty-four hours the revolution through space that it takes light, traveling at the rate of two hundred and twenty-five miles a second, hundreds of years to make. The hypothesis of the earth rotating around its axis gives a more satisfying explanation of this phenomenon.

Consequently, if it can not be scientifically and mathematically proved that the earth has a double movement, it is more convenient to hold this theory: astronomical calculations are made easier by it, and reason submits to it more readily.

History of Mexico in one Paragraph.—Some ingenious writer in the City of Mexico has recently compressed into less than 100 words a fairly accurate summary of the history of Mexico, setting forth most of its epoch-making events, together with the dates. We reproduce this interesting epitome:

"Asia probably furnished Anahuac's shadowy tribes. Primitive Aztec civilization, suggesting Egypt's and Hindustan's, ended intrepid Cuauhtemoc, Montezuma's nephew. Modest Grijalva discovered (1518) and persevering Cortes, Marina's lord, after defeat, conquered (1521) Mexico for Spain. Cortes' militarism and the tyranny of two royal audiencias preceded (1535) the yoke of sixty-four viceroys. Revolution begun (1810) by martyred Hidalgo, continued by patient Morlos, ended (1882) in independence, achieved by mistaken Iturbide, whose empire fell (1824), generals, dictators and presidents supervening. Texan independence (1836) preceded war with the Americans (1840), and, dreaming Maximilian's imperialism failing (1867), left Diaz's peaceful and progressive republic."

Let some one now, with the foregoing paragraph as a model, undertake to epitomize the history of the United States. Perhaps if history be boiled down to its essential elements, people will be more apt to learn it. Most of us are so busy with the concerns of the present that we have little time to devote to the past.

Did Shakespeare Write the Psalms?—A good satire at the expense of the Baconian cipherists has been perpetrated by an anonymous Englishman, who shows by methods quite as defensible as those used in demonstrating that Bacon wrote the Shakespearean plays, that Shakespeare really wrote the book of psalms. For his system it is necessary to spell the poet's name either Shakespear or Shakespeare, both of which are permissible. In the name "Shakespear," he points out, there are four vowels and six consonants, which make the number forty-six. Turning to psalm 46 (in the King James translation), the forty-sixth word from the beginning is "shake," and the forty-sixth word from the end, excluding the "selah," is "spear." What could be plainer?

——An exhibit in the Illinois section of the Palace of Agriculture at the World's Fair illustrates the futility of the fertilization of soils unless the needs of the soil are investigated and the element in which it is lacking supplied. The ten-thousandth part of an acre of the ten types of soil most prevalent in Illinois are on exhibition, and the needs of each in nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium, three important elements in the composition of soils, are shown. This is done by a comparison with the type which the Illinois soil survey has established as the standard of fertility. Some are lacking in nitrogen, some in potassium and some in phosphorus. How these soils should be supplied with the element necessary and not fertilized at haphazard is the lesson which the exhibit purposes teaching the visitor. Samples of corn raised before fertilization on the lands that were lacking in one of the three elements, and after the proper fertilization had been made, are also on exhibition to show the value of scientific fertilization.

——Some of the papers urge that ability to read and write should be a legal requirement from all immigrants admitted to the United States, the object being to secure that they shall be good citizens. But is that object attained by such qualifications? Are not our worst citizens—bribers, grafters, political corruptionists generally—persons who can read and write—many of them gentlemen of college education?—N. Y. *Freeman's Journal* (No. 3705.)

——The editor of THE REVIEW begs to express his sincere thanks, and those of the whole Preuss family, to all who have condoled with us in the demise of the late Dr. Edward Preuss; especially to the bishops and priests who promised to remember our dear departed father at the altar, and to the editors of periodicals who commented so feelingly upon his services to the Catholic cause.

——THE REVIEW knows of a good opening for a Catholic physician. Apply to this office.